**Remedy Selection—IDEM Draft August 26, 2008**

Sites that meet default closure levels, or site-specific closure levels derived without eliminating exposure pathways, are eligible for closure. For other sites, IDEM prefers that, where feasible and cost effective, responsible parties implement permanent remedies - that is, remedies that bring contaminant levels under default or site-specific closure levels derived without eliminating exposure pathways.

As a first step, responsible parties will develop and describe a plan for achieving a permanent remedy. Responsible parties always have the option of implementing a permanent remedy. Alternatively, a responsible party may demonstrate that a permanent remedy is infeasible or is not cost-effective.

Responsible parties may demonstrate that a cleanup, or a portion of a cleanup, is presumptively infeasible. IDEM considers several classes of cleanups to be presumptively infeasible. Examples include, but are not limited to, contamination under roadways or buildings, or contamination whose removal might cause serious disruption or other harm. In cases where sites clearly meet applicable criteria, IDEM anticipates that approval of presumptive infeasibility demonstrations will be *pro forma*.

Responsible parties may also demonstrate that a permanent remedy is infeasible or is not cost-effective in cases that are not presumptively infeasible. This type of infeasibility demonstration will require adequate documentation, including:

1. A list of remedial options, including those that involve pathway elimination;
2. A proposed preferred remedy;
3. A risk assessment that describes the risks associated with the proposed remedy and each rejected remedial option that is higher on IDEM's RISC Remedy hierarchy;
4. An estimation of the costs and environmental benefits of the proposed remedy and each rejected remedial option that is higher on IDEM's RISC remedy hierarchy; and
5. A reasoned justification for selection of the preferred remedy.

IDEM will review the list of remedial options, risk assessment, cost-benefit analysis, and reasoned justification for the selection of the preferred remedy. In doing so, IDEM will consider the following RISC remedy hierarchy:

1. Permanent remedy (removal or remediation)
2. Source controls (engineered controls near the source)
3. Receptor controls (engineered controls near receptors)
4. Institutional controls (e.g., land and groundwater use restrictions)

If IDEM approves the preferred remedy, it will grant closure upon successful implementation of the preferred remedy. If IDEM does not approve the preferred remedy, IDEM will explain why the preferred remedy is not adequate. The responsible party may then offer additional supporting documentation for the preferred remedy or offer an alternative remedy.